6

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT JABALPUR
WRIT PETITION NO. 2499 /1999.

(WRIT PEITION UNDER ARTICLE 226/227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA)

PETITIONER:

1. G.P. Chandrakar,
S/o Shri P.N.Chandrakar,
aged about 50 years,
C/o Bombay Market, G.E. Road,
Raipur (M.P.)

2. Yogendra Kastwar,
S/o Shri B.K. Gupta,
aged about 51 years,
C/o Bombay Market, G.E. Road,
Raipur (M.P.)

3. H.U. Pathak
S/0 Shri U.S. Pathak,
aged about 60 years,
C/o Bombay Market, G.E. Road,
Raipur (M.P.)

4. Suresh Tiwari
S/o Shri B.R. Tiwai,
aged about 40 years,
Proprietor- Anuja Advertising Agency,C/o Bombay Market,
G.E. Road, Raipur (M.P.)

5. Suraj Prasad Pachori,
S/o late Shri D.D. Pachori,
aged about 50 years,
C/o Bombay Market, G.E. Road,
Raipur (M.P.)

6. O.P. Mandeja
S/o [illegible]R.Mandeja
aged about 43 years,
C/o Bombay Market, G.E. Road,
Raipur (M.P.)

7. Mahtru Srivas,
S/o Kapil Sen,
aged about 82 years,
C/o Bombay Market, G.E. Road,
Raipur (M.P.)

//Versus//

RESPONDENTS:

1. Raipur Development Authority,A body incorporated under Section-38 of Nagar Tatha Gram Nivesh Adhiniyam, having its' office at G.E. Road, Raipur (M.P.).

2. The Chairman,
Raipur Development Authority,
Raipur (M.P.).

3. Tahsildar (Recovery Officer),
Raipur Development Authority,
Raipur (M.P.)

Surendra Kumar Khare
S.K. Khare
Civil Commissioner JBP.

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226/227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE CHHATTISGARH: BILASPUR

Single Bench: Hon'ble Shri Satish K. Agnihotri, J.

W. P. No. 2499 of 1999

Petitioners : G.P. Chandrakar & six Others.

Versus

Respondents : Raipur Development Authority and two others.

Shri Goutam Bhaduri, counsel for the petitioners.

Shri B.P. Sharma, counsel for respondents No.1 and 2.

Smt. Anju Ahuja, Deputy Government Advocate for the respondent No.3.

ORAL ORDER

(12h May, 2006)

1. I.A. No. 5009/2006, this is an application for withdrawal of the writ petition. Learned counsel appearing for the respondents have no objection, if the application is allowed.

2. In view of the averments made in the application, the application is ordered, as prayed for.

2. Consequently, the writ petition is dismissed as withdrawn. No order as to costs.

Sd/-
Satish K. Agnihotri
Judge